UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,217	06/27/2003	Takashi Imanishi	Q76309	5687
65565 SUGHRUE-265	7590 08/01/200 5 550	8	EXAM	INER
2100 PENNSY	LVANIA AVE. NW		JOYCE, WILLIAM C	
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3682	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/607,217	IMANISHI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
William C. Joyce	3682	

William C. Joyce 3682	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 17 July 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which place application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Received for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:	es the
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is la no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHING MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; of set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on fee r (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the data filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Solution Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues appeal; and/or	for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling non-allowable claim(s).	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entereduced because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provic showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	le a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance becaus See Continuation Sheet.	e:
12. □ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. □ Other:	
/William C. Joyce/ 7/30/08 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3682	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument the mesh size of the filter in the oil passage is rougher than the line filter is not persuasive. Determining a filter mesh size so as to provide a predetermined filtering capacity would have been within the skill of one in the art.

As for the Examiner's Official Notice with respect to providing a line filter in either of the transmissions of Yamamoto et al. or Imanishi since it was notoriously known in the art (page 3 in the Office Action), applicant's attention is drawn to page 3, lines 7+ of the specification which clearly disloses the known practice of using a line filter in a suction side of an transmission oil pump. Since applicant clearly admitts to the conventional use of a line filter, the request for further evidence of using a line filter is not needed.